

.

From: Servizio, Paul (DPH)
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2010 8:57 AM
To: Piro, Peter (DPH); Clemmer, Jill (DPH); 'Lawler, Michael (DPH)'
Cc: Salemi, Charles (DPH); Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
Subject: RE: anybody know the dirt on this one? GHB no deriv GCMS

Agree that there is a problem with the TMS BSTFA derivatization method in alcohol sugar drinks with BD - not much of a problem in urine in comparison. This would be slick way to go if worked on beverages.

From: Piro, Peter (DPH)
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2010 8:27 AM
To: Clemmer, Jill (DPH); 'Lawler, Michael (DPH)'
Cc: Servizio, Paul (DPH); Salemi, Charles (DPH); Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
Subject: RE: anybody know the dirt on this one? GHB no deriv GCMS

Acid conversion would likely be our approach to screening since GHB doesn't volatilize completely even at the upper temperature limits of an hp-5 column. I would be conservative and still do the TMS derivatization for GHB confirmation until the legal system tells us GBL confirmation is ok and that they will prove the rest in court. Acid conversion seems like a very good piece of supporting evidence that GHB is present.

From: Clemmer, Jill (DPH)
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2010 7:17 AM
To: 'Lawler, Michael (DPH)'; Piro, Peter (DPH)
Cc: Servizio, Paul (DPH); Salemi, Charles (DPH); Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
Subject: anybody know the dirt on this one? GHB no deriv GCMS

<http://www.restek.com/pdfs/CFAN1107.pdf>